

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 34617

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 463
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: May 14, 2009
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
FEDERICO ROMERO,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with fifteen years determinate, for conspiracy to traffic in heroin, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Stephen D. Thompson, Ketchum, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Mark W. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before PERRY, Judge, GUTIERREZ, Judge
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Federico Romero was charged with trafficking in more than twenty-eight grams of heroin and cocaine and pursuant to a plea agreement, pled guilty to conspiracy to traffic in heroin, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(6), and the state agreed to dismiss the cocaine charge. The district court sentenced Romero to a unified term of twenty years, with fifteen years determinate, and imposed a fine of \$25,000. Romero filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence, which the district court denied. Romero appeals from his judgment of conviction and sentence and from the denial of his Rule 35 motion, contending that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence and by denying his Rule 35 motion.

Where a sentence is within the statutory limits, it will not be disturbed on appeal absent an abuse of the sentencing court's discretion. *State v. Hedger*, 115 Idaho 598, 604, 768 P.2d 1331, 1337 (1989). We will not conclude on review that the sentencing court abused its discretion unless the sentence is unreasonable under the facts of the case. *State v. Brown*, 121 Idaho 385, 393, 825 P.2d 482, 490 (1992). In evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence, we consider the nature of the offense and the character of the offender, applying our well-established standards of review. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 170 P.3d 387 (2007).

A Rule 35 motion is a request for leniency which is addressed to the sound discretion of the sentencing court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho 201, 203, 159 P.3d 838, 840 (2007).

Applying the foregoing standards and having reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing Romero's sentence and by denying his Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence. Accordingly, Romero's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed, as is the denial of his Rule 35 motion.